



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,043	10/10/2003	Allan O. Devantier	11336-435 (P03061US)	3265

757 7590 12/13/2007
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

MONIKANG, GEORGE C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2615

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/13/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/684,043	Applicant(s) DEVANTIER ET AL.	
	Examiner George C. Monikang	Art Unit 2615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-78 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/12/2004</u> . | 6) ☐ Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

In regards to double patenting rejection, applicant does not submit an argument therefore the double patenting rejection stands.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29

USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 1 (Application No. 10/684,043, hereinafter referred to as '043) is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending (Application No. 10/684,208, hereinafter referred to as '208). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '043 claim 1 is a broader recitation of the same invention claimed in '208 claim 1. Therefore, '208 claim 1 is encompassed by '043 claim 1. It is critical that patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

3. Claims 5, 16, 27, 48, 56 (Application No. 10/684,043, hereinafter referred to as '043) are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 5 of copending (Application No. 10/684,208,

hereinafter referred to as '208). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '043 claims 5, 16, 27, 48, 56 are broader recitations of the same invention claimed in '208 claim 5. Therefore, '208 claim 5 is encompassed by '043 claims 5, 16, 27, 48, 56. It is critical that patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

4. Claims 31 & 59 (Application No. 10/684,043, hereinafter referred to as '043) are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 6 of copending (Application No. 10/684,208, hereinafter referred to as '208). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '043 claims 31 & 59 are broader recitations of the same invention claimed in '208 claim 6. Therefore, '208 claim 6 is encompassed by '043 claims 31 & 59. It is critical that patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

5. Claim 32 (Application No. 10/684,043, hereinafter referred to as '043) is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 7 of copending (Application No. 10/684,208,

hereinafter referred to as '208). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '043 claim 32 is a broader recitation of the same invention claimed in '208 claim 7. Therefore, '208 claim 7 is encompassed by '043 claim 32. It is critical that patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

6. Claims 6-8, 17-19, 22, 33, 36, 39, 60, 62, 64 (Application No. 10/684,043, hereinafter referred to as '043) are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of copending (Application No. 10/684,208, hereinafter referred to as '208). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '043 claims 6-8, 17-19, 22, 33, 36, 39, 60, 62, 64 are broader recitations of the same invention claimed in '208 claim 8. Therefore, '208 claim 8 is encompassed by '043 claims 6-8, 17-19, 22, 33, 36, 39, 60, 62 & 64. It is critical that patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

7. Claims 34 & 61 (Application No. 10/684,043, hereinafter referred to as '043) are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting

as being unpatentable over claim 9 of copending (Application No. 10/684,208, hereinafter referred to as '208). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '043 claims 34 & 61 are broader recitations of the same invention claimed in '208 claim 9. Therefore, '208 claim 9 is encompassed by '043 claims 34 & 61. It is critical that patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

8. Claim 35 (Application No. 10/684,043, hereinafter referred to as '043) is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 10 of copending (Application No. 10/684,208, hereinafter referred to as '208). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '043 claim 35 is a broader recitation of the same invention claimed in '208 claim 10. Therefore, '208 claim 10 is encompassed by '043 claim 35. It is critical that patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

9. Claims 37-38, 63 (Application No. 10/684,043, hereinafter referred to as '043) are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting

as being unpatentable over claim 12 of copending (Application No. 10/684,208, hereinafter referred to as '208). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '043 claims 37-38, 63 are broader recitations of the same invention claimed in '208 claim 12. Therefore, '208 claim 12 is encompassed by '043 claims 37-38, 63. It is critical that patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilcock et al, US Patent 7,266,207 B2, in view of Rabinowitz et al, US Patent Pub. 2003/0179891 A1.

Re Claim 1, Wilcock et al discloses an audio system comprising at least one loudspeaker, at least one loudspeaker location for the loudspeaker being selected based on a method for selecting the at least one loudspeaker location from potential loudspeaker locations (abstract) the method comprising: determining the potential loudspeaker locations (abstract); generating acoustic signals from at least one loudspeaker placed at the potential loudspeaker locations (abstract); statistically analyzing across at least one frequency of the predicted transfer functions for the plurality of listening positions (col. 11, lines 25-48); and selecting at least one loudspeaker location based on the statistical analysis (abstract); but fails to disclose recording transfer functions at a plurality of listening positions for the generated acoustic signals (Rabinowitz et al, fig. 4: 47-52); modifying the transfer functions based on the potential loudspeaker locations in order to generate predicted transfer functions (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031).

Taking the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al as a whole, one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to modify the audio system comprising at least one loudspeaker, at least one loudspeaker location for the loudspeaker being selected based on a method for selecting the at least one loudspeaker location from potential loudspeaker locations (abstract) the method comprising: determining the potential loudspeaker locations (abstract); generating acoustic signals from at least one

loudspeaker placed at the potential loudspeaker locations (abstract); statistically analyzing across at least one frequency of the predicted transfer functions for the plurality of listening positions (col. 11, lines 25-48); and selecting at least one loudspeaker location based on the statistical analysis (abstract) of Wilcock et al with recording transfer functions at a plurality of listening positions for the generated acoustic signals (Rabinowitz et al, fig. 4: 47-52); modifying the transfer functions based on the potential loudspeaker locations in order to generate predicted transfer functions (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031) as taught in Rabinowitz et al to find an optimum listening position.

Re Claim 2, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 1, where determining the potential loudspeaker locations comprises determining a discrete number of potential loudspeaker locations (Wilcock et al, abstract).

Re Claim 3, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 1, where modifying the transfer functions comprises accessing the transfer functions for each listening position corresponding to a combination of loudspeaker locations (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031) and combining the accessed transfer functions (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031).

Re Claim 4, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 1, where the statistical analysis is across a plurality of frequencies of the predicted transfer functions (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031).

Re Claim 9, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 1, where selecting at least one loudspeaker location comprises automatically recommending a plurality of potential loudspeaker location combinations and manually selecting one of the plurality of potential loudspeaker location combinations (Wilcock et al, abstract).

Re Claim 10, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 1, further comprising determining potential correction factors (Rabinowitz et al, para 0011); where modifying the transfer functions is based on the potential correction factors; and further comprising selecting at least one correction factor from the potential correction factors based on the statistical analysis of the predicted transfer functions (Rabinowitz et al, para 0011).

Re Claim 11, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 1, where the audio system may comprise different types of loudspeakers; where generating acoustic signals comprises placing the different types of loudspeakers in the potential loudspeaker locations (Wilcock et al, abstract); where modifying the transfer functions is based on the different types of speakers (Rabinowitz et al, fig. 4: 47-52); and further comprising selecting at least one type of speaker based on the statistical analysis (Wilcock et al, abstract).

Claim 12 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 1.

Re Claim 13, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the machine readable medium of claim 12, where the instructions for recording

transfer functions comprises instructions for storing the transfer functions in a memory (Rabinowitz et al, fig. 1: 20; para 0027).

Claim 14 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 3.

Claim 15 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 4.

Re Claim 20, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the machine readable medium of claim 12, further comprising instructions for recommending a plurality of potential loudspeaker location combinations (Wilcock et al, abstract).

Claims 21 & 23 have been analyzed and rejected according to claim 1.

Claim 24 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 2.

Re Claim 25, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 23, where recording transfer functions comprises: generating acoustic signals from at least one loudspeaker placed at each of the potential loudspeaker locations (Wilcock et al, abstract); and recording the transfer functions at the listening position for the generated acoustic signals (Rabinowitz etl al, fig. 4: 47-52).

Claim 26 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 3.

Re Claim 28, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 23, where recording transfer functions comprises

recording transfer functions at a plurality of listening positions (Wilcock et al, abstract); and where statistically analyzing the predicted transfer functions comprises analyzing the predicted transfer functions across the plurality of listening positions (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031).

Claim 29 has been analyze and rejected according to claim 4.

Claims 30 & 31 have been analyzed and rejected according to claim 28.

Re Claim 32, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 31, where the potential loudspeaker locations for a predicted transfer function are selected when the predicted transfer function more consistent than other predicted transfer functions (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031).

Re Claim 34, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 23, where the statistical analysis indicates flatness for the predicted transfer functions (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031).

Claim 35 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 32 and 34.

Claims 37 & 38 have been analyzed and rejected according to claim 28.

Re Claim 40, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 23, where the statistical analysis indicates efficiency of the predicted transfer functions (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031).

Re Claim 41 the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 40, where efficiency is examined for predetermined frequencies (Rabinowitz et al, para 0021).

Re Claim 42, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 41, where the potential loudspeaker locations for a predicted transfer function are selected when the predicted transfer function has greater efficiency than other predicted transfer functions (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031).

Re Claim 43, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 23, where the statistical analysis comprises acoustic efficiency (Rabinowitz et al, fig. 1: 19; para 0031).

Re Claim 44, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 43, where recording transfer functions comprises recording transfer functions at a plurality of listening positions (Wilcock et al, abstract); and where the acoustic efficiency comprises a mean overall level divided by a total drive level for the predicted transfer function (Rabinowitz et al, fig. 1: 19; para 0031).

Claim 45 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 42.

Re Claim 46, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 23, where the statistical analysis indicates output of predicted transfer functions (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031).

Re Claim 47, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 46, where output is examined for predetermined frequencies (Rabinowitz et al, para 0021).

Claim 49 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 42.

Re Claim 50, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 23, where recording transfer functions comprises recording transfer functions at a plurality of listening positions (Wilcock et al, abstract); and where the statistical analysis comprises mean overall level (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031).

Re Claim 51, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 23, where selecting at least one loudspeaker location based on the statistical analysis comprises selecting at least one of the potential loudspeaker locations (Wilcock et al, abstract).

Re Claim 52, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 51, where selecting at least one of the potential loudspeaker locations comprises selecting multiple loudspeaker locations (Wilcock et al, abstract).

Claim 53 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 1.

Re Claim 54, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the machine readable medium of claim 53, where the instructions for recording potential loudspeaker locations comprise instructions for receiving input identifying the potential loudspeaker locations (Rabinowitz et al, figs. 3, 4).

Claim 55 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 3.

Claim 57 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 28.

Claim 58 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 30.

Claim 59 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 31.

Claim 61 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 34.

Claim 63 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 37.

Claim 65 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 40.

Claim 66 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 43.

Claim 67 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 46.

Re Claim 68, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the machine readable medium of claim 53, further comprising instructions for recommending at least one potential loudspeaker location (Wilcock et al, abstract).

Re Claim 69, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the machine readable medium of claim 68, where a plurality of statistical analyses are performed (Wilcock et al, abstract); and where the instructions for recommending at least one potential loudspeaker location is based on weighting the plurality of statistical analyses (Wilcock et al, abstract).

Re Claim 70, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the machine readable medium of claim 68, where the statistical analysis ranks the predicted transfer functions based on at least one metric (Rabinowitz et al, para 0031), and where the instructions for recommending a configuration comprise instructions for recommending at least one potential loudspeaker based on ranking the at least one metric (Wilcock et al, abstract).

Claim 71 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 42.

Claim 72 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 1.

Claims 73 & 74 have been analyzed and rejected according to claim 21.

Re Claim 5, the combined teachings of Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al disclose the audio system of claim 4, but fail to disclose where the plurality of frequencies are less than 120 Hz.

However, such limitation is the inventor's preference thus it would have been obvious for Rabinowitz et al to modify their method for selecting at least one

loudspeaker location for the motivation of flattening the loudness of the sound in low frequencies.

Claims 16, 27, 48 & 56 have been analyzed and rejected according to claim 5.

Re Claim 6, which further recites, "where the statistical analysis is selected from the group consisting of mean spatial variance, mean spatial standard deviation, mean spatial envelope, and mean spatial maximum average." Wilcock et al and Rabinowitz et al do not explicitly disclose the group consisting of mean spatial variance, mean spatial standard deviation, mean spatial envelope, and mean spatial maximum average as claimed. Official notice is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing the group consisting of mean spatial variance, mean spatial standard deviation, mean spatial envelope, and mean spatial maximum average is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to use the group consisting of mean spatial variance, mean spatial standard deviation, mean spatial envelope, and mean spatial maximum average since they are variations of standard deviation commonly used for statical analysis.

Claims 7-8, 17-19, 22, 33, 36, 39, 60, 62 & 64 have been analyzed and rejected according to claim 6.

Claims 75 & 77 have been analyzed and rejected according to claim 28.

Claims 76 & 78 have been analyzed and rejected according to claim 6 & 28.

Contact

Application/Control Number:
10/684,043
Art Unit: 2615

Page 18

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George C. Monikang whose telephone number is 571-270-1190. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. alt Fri. Off 7:30am-5:00pm (est).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chin Vivian can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

George Monikang

12/10/2007


VIVIAN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000